

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virgiria 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/447,472	11/23/1999	JAMES B. ARMSTRONG	007412.00289	3863	
71867 BANNER & V	7590 VITCOFF , LTD	EXAM	EXAMINER		
ATTORNEYS FOR CLIENT NUMBER 007412 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200			CHOWDHURY	CHOWDHURY, SUMAIYA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20005-4051	2421			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/26/2011	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/447,472	ARMSTRONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SUMAIYA A. CHOWDHURY	2421	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit						
	SUMAIYA A. CHOWDHURY	2421						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	iress					
	HE REPLY FILED 06 September 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliand time periods:	reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which set the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) equest for Continued Examination (ROE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following							
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire it Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (1) TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7.	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	ion. FILED WITHIN					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.198(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection,	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as even if timely filed,					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	is of the date of ie appeal. Since					
AMENDMENTS								
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I They raise new issues that would require further continuous (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			DTOL OOL					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1:		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Mewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling non-allowable claim(s).								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proring the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wi vided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	explanation of					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).					
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 		•						
11. A The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowar	nce because:					
 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). Other: 	(P10/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
13. [Other								
/KRISTINE KINCAID/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421	/S. A. C./ Examiner, Art Unit 2421							

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- (a) Hokanson was relied on to teach transmitting video assets based upon it being either frequently requested or infrequently requested. Hokanson teaches the hierarchical use of various mediums for storage of the video assets where each of the video assets are prioritized within a storage hierarchy. This hierarchical structure of different memories can be treated as the equivalent of Applicant's partitioning of the storage between primary and secondary partitions. Once a video asset crosses above or below a threshold, it is transmitted to a separate storage medium; col. 2, lines 55-60, col. 3, lines 23-03, col. 9, lines 43-47, lines 55-67;
- (b) Hokanson was relied on to teach removing the infrequently requested video assets from the primary partition. Hokanson teaches once a request rate for a video asset drops below a certain threshold, the video asset is removed from the primary partition as discussed above.
- (c) The Applicant is arguing the references on a piecemeal basis. Hokanson was relied on to teach transferring video assets to another storage medium once the video asset crosses either above or below a threshold based on request rates. Goldszmidt was relied on to teach that the same content is stored in at least two servers, and that the same content is stored in at least one but less than all of the plurality of servers. It must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon indisdight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaudhin, 445 Fzd 1382, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).